

REMARKS

Claims 1-62 remain pending in the application.

Double Patenting

The Examiner rejected claims 1-62 based on a non-statutory obviousness-type double patenting over claims 1-37 of U.S. Patent No. 6,208,870.

The Applicants herewith attach a terminal disclaimer to U.S. Patent No. 6,208,870. It is respectfully requested that the rejection now be withdrawn.

Claims 1-16, 20-25, 29-47, 51-56 and 60-62 over McDowell

In the Office Action, claims 1-16, 20-25, 29-47, 51-56 and 60-62 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2001/0034224 to McDowell et al. ("McDowell"). The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

The present invention relates to **CHAT ROOMS**, whereas the cited references disclose INSTANT MESSAGING. Instant messaging is NOT a chat room as Instant Messaging is a one-on-one conversation with people in a user's "buddy list". These point-to-point Instant Messaging conversations are conversations restricted to a user's buddy list-not a group style venue as in a **chat room**.

To emphasize this important distinction, claims 1-16, 20-25 and 29-31 are amended herein to recite more clearly that **a wireless chat participant corresponding to a forwarded registration notification message is added to a chat room based on the forwarded registration notification message.**

Indeed, the Examiner agrees that "McDowell et al. fails to disclose . . . adding a user corresponding to the forwarded registration notification message to a chat session." (Office Action at 13).

Accordingly, for at least all the above reasons, claims 1-16, 20-25, 29-47, 51-56 and 60-62 are patentable over the prior art of record. It is therefore respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 17-19, 26-28, 48-50 and 57-59 over McDowell in view of Sandegren

Claims 17-19, 26-28, 48-50 and 57-59 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being obvious over McDowell in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,512,930 to Sandegren ("Sandegren"). The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

To emphasize this important distinction, claims 17-19, 26-28, 48-50 and 57-59 are amended herein to recite more clearly that a wireless chat participant corresponding to a forwarded registration notification message is added to a chat room based on the forwarded registration notification message.

As discussed above, the Examiner agrees that "McDowell et al. fails to disclose . . . adding a user corresponding to the forwarded registration notification message to a chat session." (Office Action at 13). To allegedly cure this serious deficiency, the Examiner cites col. 5, line 46 to col. 6, line 17 of Sandegren as allegedly teaching "automatically adding a user of a mobile station corresponding to a forwarded notification that the user is 'on-line', which in turn, adds the user to a list of individuals whose status of communication is of relevance to the user (see column 3 lines 1-10), which reads on claim 'chat session'." (Office Action at 13-14)

The passage at col. 3, lines 1-10 of Sandegren, relates to a "Notify Me" list-not to a chat room as now explicitly claimed by claims 17-19, 26-28, 48-50 and 57-59. A chat room is a term in the art, known clearly by those of ordinary skill in the art to be an application where individual chat participants post quotations for all other chat participants to read and respond to with a single posted quote to the chat room themselves.

Sandegren fails to teach a chat room.

Thus, even McDowell in view of Sandegren STILL fails to disclose, teach or suggest a CHAT ROOM at all, much less adding a participant based on

forwarding of a registration notification message as explicitly claimed by claims 17-19, 26-28, 48-50 and 57-59.

Accordingly, for at least all the above reasons, claims 17-19, 26-28, 48-50 and 57-59 are patentable over the prior art of record. It is therefore respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

Conclusion

All objections and rejections having been addressed, it is respectfully submitted that the subject application is in condition for allowance and a Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



William H. Bollman
Reg. No.: 36,457
Tel. (202) 261-1020
Fax. (202) 887-0336

MANELLI DENISON & SELTER PLLC
2000 M Street, N.W. 7th Floor
Washington D.C. 20036-3307